DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 649 CG 012 234

TITLE State Wide Demonstration-Dissemination of Drug Education Materials Through a Training Center and Local School Workshop Experiences. Narrative Evaluation.
PUB DATE 30 Jun 75
NOTE 26p.; Not available in hard copy due to marginal legibility

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Drug Education; Elementary Education; *Evaluation; *Instructional Materials; Intermediate Grades; Measurement Instruments; *Program Evaluation; *State Programs
IDENTIFIERS Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III

ABSTRACT

This evaluation tested the effectiveness of a drug education program among primary and intermediate level students in a Wisconsin area. While the outcomes of this report are significant to educators in Wisconsin, the specificity of methodology and instrumentation is of potential value to other groups wishing to determine the effectiveness of their own drug education programs. (CKJ)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151649

CG

E.S.E.A. TITLE III - 306

P.L. 89-10 AS AMENDED BY P.L. 91-230

NARRATIVE EVALUATION

STATE WIDE DEMONSTRATION - DISSEMINATION OF DRUG EDUCATION MATERIALS THROUGH A TRAINING CENTER AND LOCAL SCHOOL WORKSHOP EXPERIENCES

JUNE 30, 1975

COOPERATIVE EDUCATIONAL SERVICE AGENCY NO. 8

107 NORTH DOUGLAS STREET

APPLETON, WISCONSIN 54911

Mr. Kenneth Poppy, Coordinator
(414) 739-5217

Dr. Artie Kearney, Project Directo
(414) 739-1591

SG 012234

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Kearney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The data reported in this document is the result of a year long evaluation by the Title III Project Staff, which tested the effectiveness of the CESA #8 drug education program with primary and intermediate level students.

We wish to acknowledge the assistance and cooperation of the local administrative and instructional personnel, as well as the 1434 students who were involved in this project.

In addition, we wish to thank Dr. Edward DeRoche, the Chief Evaluator for this project and Dr. Dennis Spuck, Chief Statistician.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	iv
INTRODUCTION	1
EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS	4
DEFINITIONS	5
SAMPLE SIZE	6
RELIABILITY OF INSTRUMENTS	6
VALIDITY OF INSTRUMENTS	7
RESULTS AND ANALYSES	7
Drug Factual Information	7
Attitude	9
Decision Making	11
Self Concept	12
Usefulness of Materials	20
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	21
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A - DRUG FACTUAL SURVEY	22
APPENDIX B - DRUG ATTITUDE INVENTORY	23
APPENDIX C - DECISION MAKING SURVEY	24
APPENDIX D - PIERS-HARRIS CHILDREN'S SELF CONCEPT SCALE	25

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Reliability of Instruments	6
2.	Drug Factual Survey - Grades 2-6	8
3.	Drug Attitude Inventory - Primary Level	9
4.	Drug Attitude Inventory - Intermediate Level..	10
5.	Decision Making Survey - Intermediate Level...	11
6.	Piers-Harris - Primary Level	13
7.	Piers-Harris - Intermediate Level	14
8.	Piers-Harris - Primary & Intermediate Level...	15
9.	Piers-Harris - Percentage of Gain Scores	16
10.	Piers-Harris - Average Change in Scores.....	16
11.	Critical Incident Log - Teachers Evaluation...	19

INTRODUCTION

During the 1974-75 academic school year, CESA #8 personnel tested the effectiveness of the CESA #8 drug education materials; i.e. Teacher Activity Package TAP-Values; Teacher Activity Package TAP-Self Concept; Learning Activity Package LAP-Values; Learning Activity Package - Self Concept; and Drug Information Package DIP to see if they;

1. Provided drug factual information to primary and intermediate level students.
2. Helped develop in primary and intermediate level students a positive attitude towards the proper use of drugs.
3. Helped develop in intermediate level students decision-making skills.
4. Improved the self concept of primary and intermediate level students.
5. Were useful to teachers at the primary and intermediate levels.

The schools involved in this project were located in the cities of Appleton, Kaukauna, and Winneconne. The three schools participating in Appleton were Johnston, McKinley, and Richmond Elementary Schools with a student population in grades two through six of 313, 368, and 196 respectively. Thirty-three teachers in grades two through six were involved from these schools.

The three schools participating in Kaukauna were Nicolet, Quinney, and Park Elementary Schools with a student population in grades two through six of 143, 109, and 175 respectively. Sixteen teachers in grades two through six were involved from these schools.

The two schools participating from Winneconne were Winneconne Central and Winchester Elementary Schools with a student population in grades two and three of 51 and 78 respectively. Five teachers in grades two and three were involved from these schools.

Richmond, Park, and Winchester Elementary Schools were the control schools. Students from the control group were matched with those in the experimental group in types of community and in ability levels. No drug education materials, teacher-training sessions, or classroom demonstrations were given to these teachers and students.

The five remaining schools were identified as schools where the drug education materials were used by participating teachers; where participating teachers attended teacher-training sessions; and the project staff did classroom demonstrations. (Experimental Group)

There were a total of 985 students and 36 teachers in the experimental group and 449 students and 18 teachers in the control group.

The following tests were developed by the Project Staff:

A. Drug Factual Survey

B. Drug Attitude Inventory

C. Decision Making Survey

The "Drug Factual Survey" was teacher-administered as a pre/posttest to primary and intermediate level students in the experimental and control groups. Separate tests were developed for each grade level. (See Appendix A)

The "Drug Attitude Inventory" was teacher-administered as a posttest to intermediate level students in the experimental and control groups. (See Appendix B)

The "Decision Making Survey" was teacher-administered as a posttest to intermediate level students in the experimental and control group. (See Appendix C)

A standardized test, the "Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale" was administered by the Project Staff as a pre/posttest to primary and intermediate level students in the experimental and control groups. This test was administered orally to each class to assure consistency in its administration. (See Appendix D)

The data from these tests were calculated and analyzed. The results are summarized in this report.

EVIDENCE OF EFFECTIVENESS

Dr. Edward DeRoche from Marquette University was the Chief Evaluator for this project. Dr. Dennis Spuck from University of Wisconsin-Madison was the Chief Statistician for this project.

In order to determine the effectiveness of the methods and materials used in this project, the following hypotheses were tested:

H1: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the primary level on the "Drug Factual Survey".

H2: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the intermediate level on the "Drug Factual Survey".

H3: There is no significant difference between the posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the primary level on the "Drug Attitude Inventory".

H4: There is no significant difference between the posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the intermediate level on the "Drug Attitude Inventory".

H5: There is no significant difference between the posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the intermediate level on the "Decision Making Survey".

H6: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the primary level on the "Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale".

H7: There is no significant difference between the pretest and posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the intermediate grade level on the "Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale".

DEFINITIONS

1. **Significant differences:** A level of confidence of .05 was used.

2. **Primary level:** Grades 2 and 3.

3. **Intermediate level:** Grades 4,5, and 6.

4. **Experimental group:** The experimental group consisted of teachers and students in grades two through six who volunteered to be in this project and carry out its tasks. Students from this group were matched with those from the control group in types of community and in ability levels.

5. **Control group:** This group consisted of teachers and students in grades two through six who were not exposed to any of the methods and materials in this project. The students in this group were part of the testing program only. Students from this group were matched with those from the experimental group in types of community and in ability levels.

The experimental and control group mean scores were compared as follows:

One-way analysis of variance:

x pr. vs C pr.
x int. vs C int.

X_2 vs C_2
X_3 vs C_3
X_4 vs C_4
X_5 vs C_5
X_6 vs C_6

X = experimental group; C = control group; pr. = primary grades (2,3); int. = intermediate grades (4,5,6); 2 = grade 2; 3 = grade 3; 4 = grade 4; 5 = grade 5; 6 = grade 6.

SAMPLE SIZE

The size of the sample from the experimental and control groups were:

GRADE	EXPERIMENTAL GROUP*	CONTROL GROUP*
2	173	65
3	268	160
4	202	54
5	256	142
6	86	28

*Test data numbers differ because of absences.

RELIABILITY OF INSTRUMENTS

The reliability of each of the instruments used in this project was determined by means of the alpha coefficient (see page 210 of Psychometric Theory by Junn C. Nunnally, McGraw-Hill, 1967). The alpha coefficients for the instruments were as follows:

TABLE 1

TEST INSTRUMENT	ALPHA COEFFICIENT
Drug Factual Survey Grade 2	.57
Drug Factual Survey Grade 3	.58
Drug Factual Survey Grade 4	.66
Drug Factual Survey Grade 5	.16
Drug Factual Survey Grade 6	.51
Drug Attitude Inventory - Primary	.60
Drug Attitude Inventory - Intermediate	.48
Decision Making Survey	.76
Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale	
Factor I (Behavior)	.79
Factor II (Intellectual & School Status)	.79
Factor III (Physical Appearance & Attributes)	.75
Factor IV (Anxiety)	.71
Factor V (Popularity)	.64
Factor VI (Happiness & Satisfaction)	.70
Total (All items)	.92*

*This corresponds with the reliability data reported in the Manual for the Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale; the Kuder-Richardson Formula 21 coefficients ranged from .89 to .93 in grades 3 and 6.

VALIDITY OF INSTRUMENTS

The validity of the local evaluative instruments was determined by using the procedure described in Van Dalen and Meyer's Understanding Educational Research (McGraw Hill: New York, p. 313-314); namely, that "the test constructor analyzes the content of the factor that he intends to appraise and structures a representative instrument to measure the various aspects of that content.... When checking content validity, the test constructor, along with the aid of others, judges the extent to which test items present a representative sample of the universe of the content that the test is designed to measure."

The validity of the standardized instrument can be found on pages five and six of the test manual.

RESULTS AND ANALYSES

Drug Factual Information. The first and second hypotheses stated that there would be no significant difference between the pre/posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the primary and intermediate levels on the "Drug Factual Survey". The results appear on the following page.

TABLE 2

Drug Factual Survey - Grades 2 - 6

(Pretest and Posttest Comparison between experimental and control groups)

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
2	Pre	157	12.14	189.28	.000*
	Post	158	14.55		
3	Pre	259	91.23	27.58	.000*
	Post	246	10.11		
4	Pre	164	14.07	22.94	.000*
	Post	196	15.41		
5	Pre	242	11.41	28.22	.000*
	Post	232	12.46		
6	Pre	86	12.12	44.19	.000*
	Post	85	14.52		

CONTROL GROUP

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
2	Pre	63	12.4	.038	.845
	Post	65	12.5		
3	Pre	155	88.45	6.69	.010*
	Post	156	94.10		
4	Pre	54	12.55	.362	.548
	Post	51	12.86		
5	Pre	135	11.74	6.91	.009*
	Post	140	11.07		
6	Pre	27	11.22	.175	.678
	Post	26	11.46		

*significant at .05 level

These two hypotheses are rejected. There was a significant difference in the experimental group pre/posttest mean scores on the "Drug Factual Survey" at all grade levels. However, since there were significant differences found in the pre/posttest mean scores in grades 3 and 5 in the control group, it is difficult to determine whether the changes in the mean scores in grades 3 and 5 in the experimental group were due to the CESA #8 drug education materials or to some other factors. Nevertheless, the experimental group did score higher than the control group at each grade level.

Attitude

The third and fourth hypotheses stated that there would be no significant difference between the posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the primary and intermediate levels on the "Drug Attitude Inventory." The results are as follows:

TABLE 3

Drug Attitude Inventory - Primary Level

(Posttest Comparison between experimental and control groups)

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
2	X	153	35.2	5.50	.02*
	C	86	34.2		
3	X	243	35.6	14.75	.0005*
	C	125	34.4		
TOTAL PRIMARY	X	396	35.4	19.97	.0005*
	C	211	34.4		

*significant at .05 level

The third hypothesis is rejected. That is, there were significant differences in attitudes between the experimental and control groups at the primary level. The methods and materials used in this project appear to influence primary level students' attitudes toward drugs.

TABLE 4

Drug Attitude Inventory - Intermediate Level

(Posttest Comparison between experimental and control groups)

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
4	X	194	34.8	.15	.697
	C	50	34.9		
5	X	230	35.7	2.01	.157
	C	139	35.4		
6	X	85	35.7	.31	.579
	C	26	35.4		
TOTAL INTERMEDIATE	X	509	35.4	.125	.724
	C	215	35.3		

*significant at .05 level

The fourth hypothesis is not rejected. As far as finding differences in attitudes between the experimental and control groups at the intermediate level, there were no significant differences found. Although students' attitude towards proper and improper use of drugs improved at the intermediate level, the improvement was not significant at the .05 level.

Several reasons come to mind for the lack of attitudinal differences between the experimental and control groups at the intermediate level. First, the reliability of the instrument (.48) at the intermediate level was quite low.

Secondly, attitudes are more difficult to change as children become older because they have had more years to form attitudes than have younger children. Older children have to unlearn old attitudes before they can learn new ones.

Thirdly, the drug education materials did not deal specifically with attitudes. Attitude development towards the proper and improper use of drugs was inferred from the self concept, values, and drug factual materials.

Decision Making

The fifth hypothesis stated that there would be no significant difference between the posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the intermediate level on the "Decision Making Survey". The results are as follows:

TABLE 5

Decision Making Survey - Intermediate level

(Posttest Comparison between experimental and control groups)

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
4	X	189	52.5	13.13	.0005*
	C	49	48.1		
5	X	230	52.9	.49	.480
	C	116	52.3		
6	X	85	54.5	4.16	.044*
	C	26	51.5		
TOTAL	X	504	53	9.64	.002*
	C	191	51.1		

*significant at .05 level

The fifth hypothesis is rejected. The methods and materials used in this project appear to develop in intermediate level students decision-making skills. If we look at each grade level individually rather than as a total, we find that there were no significant differences between posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at grade five. However, the overall effect on intermediate level students was significant.

Self Concept

The sixth and seventh hypotheses stated that there would be no significant difference between the pre/posttest mean scores in the experimental and control groups at the primary and intermediate levels on the "Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale." The results appear on the following page.

TABLE 6

Piers-Harris - Primary Level

(Pre and Posttest Comparison between experimental and control groups)

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
2	Pre	184	58.70	.235	.629
	Post	152	59.33		
3	Pre	231	58.50	.918	.339
	Post	246	59.62		
TOTAL PRIMARY	Pre	415	58.59	1.12	.290
	Post	398	59.51		

CONTROL GROUP

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
2	Pre	63	59.09	.231	.631
	Post	61	57.91		
3	Pre	159	55.71	.184	.668
	Post	148	56.39		
TOTAL PRIMARY	Pre	222	56.67	.016	.899
	Post	209	56.84		

*significant at .05 level

The sixth hypothesis is not rejected. As far as finding differences in self concept between pre/posttest means scores in the experimental and control groups, there were no significant differences

found. Although students in the experimental group had more positive self concepts than did students in the control group (as indicated by the mean scores) these differences were not significant.

TABLE 7

Piers-Harris - Intermediate Level

(Pre and Posttest Comparison between the experimental and control groups)

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
4	Pre	219	57.23	4.16	.042*
	Post	184	59.95		
5	Pre	248	56.86	7.46	.007*
	Post	234	59.77		
6	Pre	84	54.69	5.24	.023*
	Post	77	59.02		
TOTAL INTERMEDIATE	Pre	551	56.68	15.75	.000*
	Post	495	59.72		

CONTROL GROUP

GRADE	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
4	Pre	50	52.44	.905	.343
	Post	78	55.05		
5	Pre	136	55.35	.400	.527
	Post	140	56.29		
6	Pre	28	54.14	.577	.451
	Post	27	51.44		
TOTAL INTERMEDIATE	Pre	213	54.17	1.42	.234
	Post	246	55.65		

*significant at .05 level

The seventh hypothesis is rejected. It appears that the methods and materials used in this project did have an influence on students' self concepts at the intermediate grade level.

If we look at the experimental control groups as a total group, it appears that the methods and materials used in this project did have an overall effect on students' self concept. There were no significant differences found in the control group. The results appear below.

TABLE 8

Piers-Harris - Primary and Intermediate Level

(Pre and Posttest Comparison for total group sample between experimental and control groups)

EXPERIMENTAL GROUP

	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN SCORES	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
TOTAL GROUP	Pre	966	57.50	13.66	.000*
	Post	893	59.63		

CONTROL GROUP

	GROUP	SAMPLE SIZE	MEAN SCORES	F-RATIO	SIGNIFICANCE LEVEL
TOTAL GROUP	Pre	435	55.44	.677	.411
	Post	455	56.20		

*significant at .05 level

The "Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale" is composed of six general categories; these being (1) Behavior; (2) Intellectual and School Status; (3) Physical Appearance and Attribute; (4) Anxiety; (5) Popularity; (6) Happiness and Satisfaction.

A by-class breakdown of the pre and posttest results ("Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale") is summarized in Table 9 and Table 10 below.

TABLE 9

Percentage of Classes with Gain Scores

	Behavior	Intellectual & School Status	Physical Appearance & Attributes	Anxiety	Popularity	Happiness & Satisfaction	T
X	74%	74%	51%	74%	7[illegible]%	70%	
C	50%	66%	55%	72%	64%	38%	

TABLE 10

Average Change in Scores

	Behavior	Intellectual & School Status	Physical Appearance & Attributes	Anxiety	Popularity	Happiness & Satisfaction	T
X	+.21	+.61	+.14	+.36	+.35	+.11	+
C	-.02	+.15	+.01	+.26	+.18	-.09	+

The following is a by-factor analysis of the gain scores (on the Piers-Harris) of the classrooms in the experimental and control groups:

1. Behavior: 74% vs. 50%; +.21 vs. +.02. This indicates a clearly defined difference in favor of the experimental group. The students who were involved in this drug education program exhibited much improved behavior as per the Piers-Harris. This is in agreement with the teacher evaluations of students which also indicated improved student behavior during and after implementation of the CESA #8 drug education program.
2. Intellectual and School Status: 74% vs. 66% and +.16 vs. +.15. Although there were only 8% more classes with gain scores in the experimental group, the average change in scores indicates a marked improvement in the experimental group. As per the "Piers-Harris Children's Self Concept Scale," classes involved in this drug education program exhibited more than four times as much improvement in Intellectual and School Status as did the control group. This finding is further substantiated by the teacher evaluations of students which indicated more classroom participation, more student interest in school, and better teacher-student relationships upon implementation of this drug education program.
3. Physical Appearance and Attributes: 51% vs. 55% and +.14 vs. +.01. This factor was not a major emphasis of the program. Consequently the slight differences indicated are as expected.
4. Anxiety: 74% vs. 72% and +.36 vs. +.25. This too, was a minor emphasis of the program. The slight differences do reflect some impact, however. The students in the experimental group were taught problem solving and decision making, and consequently exhibited less anxiety.

5. Popularity: 79% vs. 64% and +.35 vs. +.18. This was one of the major emphasis of the program. The results indicate that student involved in the program improved nearly twice as much (+.35 vs. +.18) in popularity. The Secret Friend exercise and other interhuman relations exercises which are an integral part of the CESA #8 drug education program appear to have clearly had the desired effect.

6. Happiness and Satisfaction: 70% vs. 38% and +.11 vs. -.09. The thrust of Happiness and Satisfaction is satisfaction with self ("I like being the way I am"; "I wish I were different"). The broad, all-encompassing nature of Happiness and Satisfaction makes change in this factor difficult. Nevertheless, students in classrooms in which this program was implemented appear to have been much more satisfied with themselves than were students in the no-treatment control group. This is a reflection of the broad, extensive, thorough nature of the CESA #8 drug education self concept materials.

7. Total: 71% vs. 61% and +2.05 vs. +0.64. The experimental group showed more than three times as much overall improvement (+2.05 vs. +0.64) as did the control group. In classrooms in which teachers chose to implement the CESA #8 drug education program, the impact appears to have been considerable.

In summary, these results indicate that students in classrooms involved in this drug education program showed marked improvement in behavior, intellectual and school status, popularity, happiness and satisfaction, and total self concept.

Usefulness of Materials

The usefulness of the materials to teachers was measured in terms of whether or not there were observable changes in students' behavior which might be contributed to the CESA #8 drug education program. For example, if a shy student became more open in class, it might be because of the program. The materials used in this program encouraged students' participation.

Teachers were asked to keep a Critical Incident Log on selected students and record any behavior changes that might be attributed to the CESA #8 program. Some of the behavior changes that teachers were looking for in their students were:

(a) More open in class.

(b) More willing to participate in the activities in the TAP's and LAP's.

(c) More tolerant of the responses made by others in the class during TAP and LAP exercises.

(d) Less of a behavior problem.

(e) Talks to the teacher more about his/her feelings.

(f) Shows positive changes in behavior outside of the classroom.

Teachers' evaluation of students was written on 99 students. These evaluations indicate improved student behavior during and after implementation of the CESA #8 drug education program. A summary of the results appear on the following page.

TABLE 11

Critical Incident Log

(Teachers Evaluation)

Total number of students': 99

	Behavior Changes
72	More open in class. (72.73%)
69	More willing to participate in the activities in the TAP's and LAP's. (69.70%)
40	More tolerant of the responses made by others in the class during TAP and LAP exercises. (40.40%)
46	Less of a behavior problem. (46.47%)
72	Talks to you more about his/her feelings. (72.73%)
32	Asks that the CESA #8 materials be used more often in class. (32.32%)
60	Indicates that he/she enjoys the times spent using these materials. (60.61%)
54	Positive changes in behavior outside of the classroom. (54.55%)
	Additional behavior changes added to list by teachers:
9	Helped shyness (9.09%)
10	More confidence (10.10%)
5	Improved overall attitude towards school (5.05%)
3	Improve quality of classwork (3.03%)
3	Makes decisions/ w/o peer influence (Less peer influence). (3.03%)
3	Improve self-concept (takes care of appearance, more happy about self.) (3.03%)

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the findings of this study, teachers using this approach to drug education can expect to achieve the following:

(a) Significantly increase students' factual knowledge about drugs.

(b) Improve students' attitude towards the proper and improper use of drugs.

(c) Significantly increase students' decision-making skills.

(d) Signficantly increase students' feelings of self-worth.

Although the findings from this study were significant in themselves, one can hope to find even greater significance when local evaluation instruments have been revised.

The results from this study reflect that this approach to drug education is effective. This drug education program provides students with pertinent information about drugs, a healthy attitude towards proper and improper use of drugs, decision-making skills with which they can decide for themselves (based upon pertinent drug factual information), and a significantly improved self concept which will generally prevent the psychological need that so often results in dependency.